

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 25 are pending, with Claims 1, 3, 5, and 22 through 25 being independent. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 22 through 25 have been amended.

Claims 1 through 25 again were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,812,747 (Kayano, et al.), or under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kayano, et al. in view of one or more of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,516,157 B1 (Maruta, et al.), 5,933,984 (Maniwa), and 6,226,095 B1 (Fukuta). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 3, 22, and 23 variously recite, inter alia, that the request is made by the user of the first image-forming apparatus via a user interface that displays to the user information about the image data stored in the another image-forming apparatus.

Claims 5, 24, and 25 variously recite, inter alia, displaying, to a user of the image-forming apparatus, information about the image data stored in the remote image-forming apparatus, and for prompting the user of the image-forming apparatus to select therefrom image data for printing by the image-forming apparatus.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kayano, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 1, 3, 5, 22, 23, 24, and 25. Applicant respectfully understands Kayano, et al. to disclose, e.g., that copying machines 2 and 3 send to copying machine 1 status information (step R014), that copying machine 1 sends the selected copying machines 2 and 3 a connection mode signal and copying conditions (allotted paper quantity and paper size) (step R106), that copying machine 1 sends the image data to copying machines 2 and 3 (step R109), and when copying machines 2 and 3 receive the image

data they start copying for the allotted quantity (step R111) (e.g., col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 48). However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither the foregoing nor the remainder of Kayano, et al. provides either a description or a suggestion of the above-discussed claimed features. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in Kayano, et al., Maruta, et al., Maniwa, and Fukuta that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to attempt to modify Kayano, et al., assuming, arguendo, that the documents could be combined, so as to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicant earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/lw

DC_MAIN 225520v1